

## REMARKS

### Introduction

By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 15, 29, and 38 are amended and claim 43 is added. Thus, claims 1-43 are pending and under examination. Claims 1, 15, and 29 are amended to state that the token emulates a floppy drive containing a floppy disk. Support for the claim amendment can be found at, for example, page 11 of the originally filed specification, lines 12-20. Claims 2 and 38 are amended to correct typographical errors. It is believed that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 6-9, 10, 20-23, 24, and 34-38.

### Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. 2004/0030908 to Lin et al (Lin)

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5, 11-19, 25-33 and 39-42 as anticipated by Lin. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 1 recites the step of "emulating a floppy drive containing a floppy disk and communicatively coupled to the computer in a token . . ." Lin is directed to a system and method of data encryption for controlling access to a hard disk or optical drive. Lin discloses the use of data encryption and decryption combined with a token to control access to a data storage device. Lin does not disclose the step of emulating, much less the step of emulating a floppy drive.

The Office Action, at page 2, asserts "Lin discloses emulating a floppy drive communicatively coupled to the computer via a USB-compliant interface in (fig.1 and page 2 paragraph 0028)." Figure 1 of Lin shows a token having a processor, memory, and a secure region. Paragraph 28 describes the connection of the token to the computer via a data port.

There is no disclosure in paragraph 28, or anywhere in the Lin specification, of emulating a floppy drive.

The Office Action further asserts that, "Lin discloses the password is stored as a file in the emulated floppy drive in (page 3, pp 0030)." However, paragraph 30 of Lin states only that the token's memory device includes a secure region where the password may be stored. Again, there is no disclosure, either in paragraph 30 or anywhere else in the Lin specification, of emulating a floppy drive.

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must disclose each and every limitation of the claim. As Lin does not disclose at least the step of emulating, Lin cannot anticipate claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over the Lin reference. Claims 2-14, which depend from claim 1, are allowable at least for being dependent from an allowable claim.

Independent claim 15 recites a "means for emulating a floppy drive containing a floppy disk and communicatively coupled to the computer in a token . . ." The Office Action rejected claim 15, citing to the same portions of the Lin specification. Lin fails to anticipate claim 15 for the same reason Lin fails to anticipate claim 1: there is no disclosure anywhere in the Lin specification of emulation. Accordingly, claim 15, and its dependent claims 16-28, are allowable over Lin.

Again, the Action cites Lin at Figure 1 and paragraph 28 as the basis for rejecting claim 29. Claim 29 recites a token comprising "memory for storing a plurality of processor instructions to emulate a floppy drive" As established above, Lin fails to disclose a token that has the ability to emulate a floppy drive. The specification is void of any disclosure regarding emulation. Accordingly, claim 29, and its dependent claims 30-42, are allowable over Lin.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103: Lin in view of US 2001/0023375 to Shen (Shen)

The Office Action rejected claims 3, 17, and 31 as obvious over Lin in view of Shen.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Action fails to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the references must teach or suggest all of the limitations of Applicant's claims (MPEP § 2142). The Office Action alleges that Shen discloses an ATA-3 password. However, Shen, like Lin, fails to disclose a token with the ability to emulate a floppy drive. Lin does not disclose emulation anywhere in the specification, much less emulation of a floppy drive by a token. Claims 3, 17, and 31 depend from independent claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively, and are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above regarding claims 1, 15, and 29. The combination of Lin with Shen fails to disclose these required claim limitations, and a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is not proper. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

New claim 43

Claim 43 is added to specify an embodiment of the invention where the hard drive is unlocked by the token sending a password to the hard drive. It is believed that this claim does not introduce new matter. In this embodiment, no processing of the password is necessary. Claim 43 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner

reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance indicating the allowability of claims 1-43 and that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 1, 2007

Kavita B. Lepping  
Jeffri A. Kaminski  
Registration No. 42,709  
Kavita B. Lepping  
Registration No. 54,262  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998  
Telephone: (202) 344-4000  
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

KBL 848443